



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

technical scholarship. Fortunately, the use of this volume can be recommended especially for its cultural value. It will help the student to lay hold of human life in ancient Roman days, and will give him a new kind of interest in the text he is studying. Instead of remaining a thing unrelated in time or space, the book in his hand has become intimately associated with the vicissitudes of the higher interests of mankind. He cannot help but realize that the Roman past has had a great deal to do with his present. Points of connection with the beginnings of modern literatures will at least be suggested to him, perhaps also the inquiry whether only Latin scholars make use of the principles and methods of palæography and criticism. If he does not look forward to philology as a life pursuit, he will at least have gained a truer estimate of the services rendered by scholarship to civilization; if he does, the transition to the university point of view can easily be made.

ALEXIS F. LANGE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

The Sources of Spenser's Classical Mythology. By Alice Elizabeth Sawtelle, Ph.D. (Yale). Silver, Burdett, & Co.: New York, Boston, Chicago, 1896. Pp. 128.

THERE are at present various indications of a Spenser revival, and this is well. For, in a generation which professes to be Romantic in its tastes, the half-knowledge hitherto grudgingly vouchsafed to the most intensely poetical of all the Elizabethans has been a distressing paradox, not to say a reproach. Miss Sawtelle's book is, within its limits, a generous and praiseworthy effort to facilitate the study of her author. As far as I have been able to examine it, her treatment is both full and accurate.

In arrangement the book is an alphabetical lexicon, ranging from 'Acheron' to 'Zephyrus.' By a skilful use of cross-references Miss Sawtelle is able to treat certain subjects with reasonable coherence. Thus, 'Actæa,' 'Euagore,' 'Euarna', etc., are referred to 'Nereids.' Other features of arrangement evince an orderly no less than a scholarly mind. In brief, one does not often meet with a book so thoroughly adapted to its specific object.

From Professor Cook's Prefatory Note the reader will learn that the book was undertaken as a Yale doctoral thesis. Objections have

been raised against this, on the ground that a 'thesis' ought to formulate 'conclusions.' Such objections seem to me hypercritical, for more reasons than one. In the first place, scholarship is scholarship, in whatever form it be cast. The mere collection of data, carefully ascertained, sifted from superfluous detail, procured from remote quarters, is quite enough for most of us, with or without conclusions. In the next place, conclusions — in literary study — are not always possible, and are not infrequently unwise. For example, how many 'conclusions' in English metre have we been forced to shake our heads over in German theses of the past ten years!

As to Spenser's mythology in particular, I am persuaded that the times are not yet ripe for theory. In justifying this view I must dissent from Miss Sawtelle at the only point where she has ventured to theorize. At p. 9 she says 'there is every evidence . . . that he [Spenser] drew his inspiration directly from the fountain-heads. . . . Although fascinated by Ovid, and under the spell of Virgil, he is inspired none the less by the Greek authors, from Homer and Hesiod down to Theocritus and Bion.' There is no rigorous logical connection between these two sentences; it is not perfectly clear that the writer believes Spenser to have got his knowledge of Homer and Hesiod, of Theocritus and Bion, directly from the Greek. Yet this is her apparent meaning. If so, I would dissent; at least, I would hesitate as to Theocritus and Bion.¹ Is it likely that Spenser's attention was directed to them in the original? Were the Greek texts even accessible to him? I would remind Miss Sawtelle of her own quotation, p. 44 *sub* 'Cupid,' from E. K.: 'But who lists more at large to behold Cupids colours and furniture, let him reade ether Propertius, or Moschus his Idyllion of winged love, being now most excellently *translated into Latine* by the singuler learned man, Angelus Politianus.'

The italics are mine; the phrase makes one pause and hesitate.

¹ There were editions of Moschus and Bion together (to say nothing of earlier editions with Theocritus), in 1565, 1570, 1579, 1584, and 1596; these were all Greek, with Latin translation. The fine Stephanus edition of the principal Greek poets appeared in 1566, and may well have been accessible to Spenser. E. K.'s reference to the Latin translation might be for the benefit of comparatively unlearned readers. As to the Elizabethan knowledge of Greek, note that H. Stephanus dedicated his edition of Herodian to Sidney, with the remark that unless court life had transformed him from what Stephanus had known him in Germany and Austria, he would stand in no need of an interpreter (Gildersleeve, in *Am. J. Phil.* XII. 385.) — A. S. C.

Not that I would deny to Spenser all knowledge of Greek at first hand. That would be absurd, in the light of Bryskett's well-known letter on Spenser, quoted in Dean Church's life of Spenser, ch. iv. But I cannot help suspecting, on the one hand, that Spenser was not familiar with the Greek minor poets in the original; on the other hand, that his knowledge of Greek was restricted to the usual school-texts, and to such philosophical writers as Plato. I question his knowledge at first hand of historians like Diodorus Siculus, and Ctesias (see 'Semiramis,' p. 110).

Again, did Spenser 'follow' Dares Phrygius (see 'Amazon,' p. 19)? Did he not rather follow one or other of the numerous mediæval adapters of Dares?

My sole motive in venturing upon these few criticisms is to show how dangerous the ground becomes, the moment one enters upon 'conclusions,' in our present state of knowledge — perhaps I might say, our present state of ignorance. For, at best, what do we truly *know* concerning classical studies in England in the days of Elizabeth? How much was genuine, native, original, how much derived through French and Italian scholars? How far was the Greek pure, how far was it colored in transmission through Latin?

Questions like these will not be answered until the entire Tudor period has been re-examined. We need more dry facts and fewer theories. And so far as Miss Sawtelle's book gives us the facts of Spenser's mythological lore, it is a valuable contribution.

In conclusion let me express a wish. Miss Sawtelle has demonstrated her capacity for this kind of work. May she not be induced to go on in it? I should gladly welcome a like book upon Milton,¹ and upon Chaucer. These three great writers, Chaucer, Spenser, Milton are the *points de repère* yet to be determined for all the study of our earlier literature. Shakespeare is already worked out, though even he might be systematized in this alphabetical arrangement. Further, I would remind Miss Sawtelle that not all Spenser's mythology is 'classical.' A good part, and a very interesting and difficult part, is Anglo-Keltic. How much of this is to be traced back to Geoffrey of Monmouth? Did Spenser get any in Ireland? We should never forget that not the least valuable side in Spenser's many-sidedness is his attitude towards Ireland. In truth, would the *Faery Queen* be quite what it is without the Keltic element?

J. M. HART.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

¹ Milton and Shakespeare are now in hand. — A. S. C.